

REMARKS

In the current and final Office Action, claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 were examined.

Claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 were rejected.

Specifically:

Claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 were "rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gong (WO 99/30217)."

Of pending claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56, six (6) claims 1, 24, 25, 37, 49, and 53 are independent. These six independent claims 1, 24, 25, 37, 49, and 53 are addressed below.

1 I. It is respectfully submitted that Gong does not anticipate (or render
2 obvious) independent claim 1, 24, 25, or 37.

3
4 A. Gong focuses on granularity that is realized with a one-to-one
5 correspondence.

6 By way of example, Gong identifies “granularity” as an advantage. (WO
7 99/30217, Page 12, Lines 25-37.) As further evidence, “Domain Mapper 248” maps
8 “Object 262” and/or “Class 260” with a single “Protection Domain Object 282” as
9 indicated by the dashed arrows in Figure 2. (See, also, WO 99/30217, Page 12,
10 Lines 21-24.) Additionally, a single “Protection Domain” is established for each
11 “received class”. (Figure 4, Steps 406 and 420, and related text.) Furthermore, each
12 object “a”, “b”, and “c” on “Calling Stack 610” is associated with a single
13 “Protection Domain”. (Figure 6, “Calling Stack 610” and “Security Policy”, and
14 related text.)

15
16 The current Office Action reads on page 3 (as part of paragraph #3 that
17 begins on page 2), at the last sentence of the first (partial) paragraph, “The ‘code
18 group’ is met by protection domain.”

19 Thus, it appears that the Office is attempting to assert a correspondence
20 between “protection domain” from Gong and **code groups** of claims 1, 24, 25, and
21 37.

22 Even assuming, *arguendo*, that it is legitimate to draw a correspondence
23 between “protection domain” and **code groups**, Gong only describes a one-to-one
24 correspondence between (i) each “protection domain object 282” and (ii) each code
25 piece and/or object class of Gong. Consequently, Gong cannot describe evaluating

1 with respect to multiple “protection domain objects 282” or generating any
2 permission information in relation to multiple “protection domain objects 282” for
3 one code piece or object class.

4
5 B. Thus, no art of record, either alone or in any combination,
6 anticipates or renders obvious at least the following elements in conjunction
7 with the other elements of their respective claims:

8 Claim 1: evaluating the evidence relative to the code groups to
9 determine membership of the code assembly in two or more of
10 the code groups . . . generating the permission grant set based
11 on two or more code-group permission sets, each code-group
12 permission set of the two or more code-group permission sets
13 being associated with a code group in which the code assembly
14 is a member.

15 Claim 24: evaluating the evidence relative to the code groups to
16 determine membership of the code assembly in two or more of
17 the code groups . . . generating the permission grant set based
18 on two or more code-group permission sets, each code-group
19 permission set of the two or more code-group permission sets
20 being associated with a code group in which the code assembly
21 is a member.

22 Claim 25: evaluating the evidence relative to the code groups to
23 determine membership of the code assembly in two or more of
24 the code groups . . . generating the permission grant set based
25 on two or more code-group permission sets, each code-group

1 permission set of the two or more code-group permission sets
2 being associated with a code group in which the code assembly
3 is a member.

4 Claim 37: evaluating the evidence set relative to the code group
5 collection to determine membership of the code assembly in
6 two or more code groups of the code group collection . . .
7 generating the permission grant set based on two or more
8 code-group permission sets, each code-group permission set of
9 the two or more code-group permission sets being associated
10 with a code group in which the code assembly is a member.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 II. It is respectfully submitted that Gong does not anticipate (or render
2 obvious) independent claim 49 or 53.

3
4 A. Gong does not address verification in any relationship with
5 permission rights.

6 By way of example, it appears that Gong addresses verification in only one
7 paragraph:

8 A class may be associated with the digital signature associated with the file
9 used to transport code defining the class, or the class definition of the class may be
10 specifically associated with a digital signature. A class that is associated with a
11 valid digital signature is referred to as being signed. Valid digital signatures are
12 digital signatures that can be verified by known keys stored in a database. If a class
13 is associated with a digital signature which can not be verified, or the class is not
14 associated with any digital signature, the class is referred to as being unsigned.
15 Unsigned classes may be associated with a default key. A key may be associated
16 with a name, which may be used to look up the key in the database.

17 (WO 99/30217, Page 8, Lines 28-35.)

18 Thus, Gong does not address verification in any relationship with permission
19 rights, much less in a contingency relationship.

20 Moreover, the current Office Action reads on page 5, at paragraph #10 in
21 pertinent part, "The limitation 'determining whether the code assembly may be
22 executed despite the verification failure' is met by block 428 in Fig. 4." However,
23 block 428 of Gong reads, "Establish Mapping of Class to Protection Domain?".
24 Step 428 is described in the text of Gong on page 12 at lines 21-24. This text is not
25 related to the verification passage on page 8 of Gong, as reproduced above.

Consequently, Gong cannot describe any verification in relationship to
permission rights, much less in a contingency determination relationship.

1 B. Thus, no art of record, either alone or in any combination,
2 anticipates or renders obvious at least the following elements in conjunction
3 with the other elements of their respective claims:

4 Claim 49: **evaluating the evidence relative to the security policy . . .**
5 *performing verification on the code assembly . . . detecting a*
6 **verification failure of the code assembly in the operation of**
7 **performing verification . . . determining whether the code**
8 *assembly may be executed despite the verification failure,*
9 *responsive to the evaluating operation.*

10 Claim 53: **generating a permission grant set, responsive to the**
11 **evaluating operation . . . determining based on the permission**
12 *grant set that a step of a verification process is unnecessary . . .*
13 **communicating to a verification module that the step of the**
14 **verification process may be bypassed . . . performing the**
15 **verification process on the code assembly with the verification**
16 **module . . . bypassing the step of the verification process,**
17 *responsive to the communicating operation.*

1 III. It is respectfully submitted that Gong does not anticipate (or render
2 obvious) dependent claims 2-23, 38-45, 50-52 and 54-56.

3
4 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 37, 49, and 53 have
5 been provided above. Claims 2-23, 38-45, 50-52 and 54-56 depend from these
6 independent claims 1, 37, 49, and 53, respectively.

7
8 Each dependent claim also includes additional element(s) militating toward
9 allowability. For example, certain claims (e.g., claims 10-16 and 40-42) recite
10 element(s) directed to a **policy level**. It is noted that Gong does not describe or
11 suggest **policy level** as claimed.

12
13 Nevertheless, it is also respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are
14 allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective
15 independent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 are allowable, and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5/2/2005

By: Keith W. Saunders
Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 x238